

This resolution is a step backward for clean water. It is a step backward for certainty. I urge my colleagues to see this resolution for what it is. It is not for clean water. It is an attack on our clean water future. It fails to provide clarity. It fails to provide consistency for our businesses, our farmers, and for many in our communities who rely on clean water who are not businesses, who are not farmers, who are not ranchers. Many of those folks look to Congress to ensure clean water, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 27, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, while the Clean Water Act has greatly improved the health of our Nation's waters, expansive interpretations of it have also led to a whole lot of uncertainty in the 50 years since it was passed, specifically when it comes to the definition of WOTUS.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration may think that they can get away with this overbearing WOTUS rule and dramatic, dramatic expansion of Federal authority, but we have to ensure that everyday Americans are not subject to this outrageous government power grab, and that is what it is.

Let's keep flawed Federal overreach out of the government by passing H.J. Res. 27.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, serving in Ohio's 9th district, and as the leading Democrat and Ranking Member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, I am keenly aware that clean and abundant water resources are vital for the success of our nation's economy and the health of our communities. The Great Lakes region which I proudly represent and champion provides drinking water for more than 40 million people and supports a \$6 trillion economy. Before us is H.J. Res. 27, another desperate attempt to weaken the Clean Water Act. After decades of reckless pollution, a fire on the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, OH helped spark an environmental movement that brought us to the passage of the visionary Clean Water Act in 1972. The 50-year legacy of the CWA is a testament to the power of bipartisan legislation that prioritizes people and communities. If successful, H.J. Res. 27 would return us to a patchwork strategy of water management that existed prior to 1972.

H.J. Res. 27 is yet another example of partisan politics that do nothing for constituents in my district in Toledo and along Lake Erie—or our neighbors throughout the Great Lakes region. Instead, this resolution undermines longstanding guidance that protects our waters. This resolution eliminates existing clarity and certainty that businesses, developers, and farmers rely on, and it creates the opportunity for our waterways to return to serving only as waste receptacles. Even with a strong Clean Water Act, much remains to be done to en-

sure clean drinking water for all; the 2014 Toledo water crisis was the direct result of toxins in the water. Further eroding our ability to protect our waters is a disservice to everyone. Today, I will vote no on H.J. Res. 27 because protecting our Great Lakes is a priority, and I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same, so that our waterways can be protected for future generations to come.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of H.J. Res. 27, which would roll back important clean water protections.

Colleagues, for over 50 years, the Clean Water Act has served as an essential pollution prevention tool and helped us clean up our nation's streams, rivers, lakes, and wetlands.

Clean water is a human right. And it is our shared responsibility to ensure we protect human health and our environment for future generations. Whether you live in the heartland near the Great Lakes, or out west near the incredible Colorado River, we all benefit from the federal protections of our waters. As one of the architects of the Clean Water Act, John Dingell, wrote and made clear the intent was to protect "all the 'waters of the United States.'"

Wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams must be protected and due to the 2019 repeal of this rule, there have been hundreds of development projects that were able to move forward with limited regulation, putting our water systems at risk. I would like to thank the Biden administration for their leadership on its rule to establish a revised definition of the "Waters of the United States" to protect our most vital natural resource—water.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this resolution and protect clean water for all Americans.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 27, which would overturn a recent Biden Administration regulation clarifying protection of America's waters under the Clean Water Act.

Communities in Minnesota and across our Nation need reliable access to clean water. Without clean water our communities don't have access to safe drinking water, farmers can't grow the food we eat, and our nurses and doctors can't clean their hands before a procedure. Clean water touches every facet of our daily lives, and our communities cannot thrive without it.

If passed, H.J. Res. 27 would block the latest waters of the United States (WOTUS) rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Army Corps of Engineers. The rule that the Biden Administration is proposing would broaden definitions of waterways subject to protection under the Clean Water Act to include connected waterways such as wetlands. The new rule also seeks to provide clarity and predictability for farmers and developers while protecting our nation's water quality and supply. H.J. Res. 27 would block this clarified rule.

For over 50 years, Republicans and Democrats have worked together to protect and restore America's waters using the authorities granted in the Clean Water Act. Members of Congress today have a responsibility to protect this important legacy. Preserving the health of America's wetlands and streams is essential to Minnesota, a state with more than 10,000 lakes and over 69,000 miles of river. Clean water touches every aspect of our daily lives, and Americans cannot survive without it.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, H.J. Res. 27 is an attack on clean water in communities all around the country.

It should be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SELF) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of the motion to recommit on H.R. 140;

Passage of H.R. 140, if ordered; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 27.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.